

From: ["Young, Howard S." <younghs@cdmsmith.com>](mailto:younghs@cdmsmith.com)
To: ["Zhen, Davis" <Zhen.Davis@epa.gov>](mailto:Zhen.Davis@epa.gov)
["Sheldrake, Sean" <sheldrake.sean@epa.gov>](mailto:sheldrake.sean@epa.gov)
CC: ["Scott Coffey" <coffeyse@cdmsmith.com>](mailto:coffeyse@cdmsmith.com)
["Vickstrom, Kyle E." <vickstromke@cdmsmith.com>](mailto:vickstromke@cdmsmith.com)
["Wardah Azhar" <azharw@cdmsmith.com>](mailto:azharw@cdmsmith.com)
Date: 7/31/2018 12:05:26 PM
Subject: Sediment coring at the International Slip

Sean and Davis,

Today the PreRD Group informed our oversight representative that due to multiple locations in the International Slip where they were getting refusal at 7 feet that they intended to forgo the FSP procedure of doing two additional contingency drives to try to achieve target depth (15 feet in this area). They were told by a client that there has been post-RI dredging in the International Slip and that is why they are only getting 7 feet of penetration and not the 13 feet of penetration that the RI cores achieved. Our oversight inspector, Wardah, told them that they need to continue to follow the FSP contingency plan until EPA has more information and a changes from the FSP is approved by EPA. Apparently, Anne Fitzpatrick has been attempting make unilateral changes from the FSP and pushing it on the field crews and expecting our field oversight person to approve it. Wardah also had to remind them that the FSP requires doing up to 3 contingency cores for locations which fail to reach the target depth.

I have written an example email for your use to communicate to Ken that a field changes request is needed prior to making this type of change.

Ken,

It has come to my attention that the field crew have been asking to change the sediment core contingency plan for cores at the International Slip that do not reach the target depth. They have provided information about post-RI dredging in the area may be the reason that the cores are getting lower penetration than the RI borings and feel that it is not needed to go through the 3 core contingency. Please note that making field changes like this must be done through the change form process where documentation and technical rationale for the change from the FSP are provided. The change form must be reviewed and approved by EPA before implementing the change in the field. Apparently, Anne Fitzpatrick was directing field crews to implement the change with expectation that our field oversight staff could approve, which is not the case.

Thank you,
Davis